To whom it may concern, I would like to thank you for allowing me to comment on the matter of

Broadcast Localism. I have been watching with great interest as I have recently learned of the possibilities of LPFM and look forward with anticipation to the time when our church is able to run one of these stations. I am not as knowledgeable as I would like to be but I felt it necessary to reply. The FCC has made great advancements in the area of broadcasting and I appreciate everything they do to protect the airwaves for the American public. In regards to the matter of Broadcast Localism, I live in a community that has several radio stations, but they seem to be owned by one or two national companies. Some of these stations have resorted to the practices of Voice-tracking and the use of National Play lists, thereby silencing any "local' influence on programming and local issues. I believe that the greatest answer to the problem of Broadcast Localism has already been created. I am referring to the LPFM service. As you are well aware, the communities in this nation are a varied group. Even in the communities themselves, there exists subgroups and varied cultures. I believe that the LPFM service is the only way to truly address the needs and concerns of a community's culturally diverse citizenship. The limited range and operating capability of LPFM stations allows communities to have "several" local influences over the airwaves, not just a couple of cookie cutter styles that are being employed nationwide. Much less, many restrictions are in place that ensure the success of LPFM such as the required non-profit status of each station and other restrictions that limit the amount of LPFM stations allowed to licensees. The greatest challenge to the implementation of these services has been the log jam that exists in the licensing stage. I believe that if measures were introduced that alleviated the many obstacles in getting a construction permit for a LPFM station, a community's true voice can be heard. The results of the recent MITRE study seems to have alleviated any concerns over possible interference. All concerns, I should say, except the concerns of major broadcasting powerhouses. I believe that once in place, LPFM stations would truly be a mouthpiece for the people, broadcasting news, public affairs, and yes, even local entertainment. The ability to broadcast a local high school sporting event should count towards local programming, as well as bringing to light local musicians and artisans that otherwise would be passed over by major markets in favor of acts that appeal to certain demographics or target audiences. In other words, let the communities themselves, not money, speak.

Thank you for the opportunity to give my feedback and I am confident that these issues will soon be resolved.

Cory Glover

Do you Yahoo!?

Take Yahoo! Mail with you! Get it on your mobile phone.

--0-1255640087-1088750901=:8822

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<DIA>

<DIV>

<DIV>

<DIV>ECFS - E-mail

Filing
<PROCEEDING>

233
< DATE> &n

07/02/04
&1t; NAME> &nbs

Glover
< ADDRESS1> &n

Langley
<STATE>

SC
<ZIP> &

NUMBER>

0558
<DESCRIPTION> &nb

to thank you for allowing me to comment on the matter of
Broadcast Localism. I have been watching with great interest as I have
recently learned of the possibilities of LPFM and look forward with
anticipation to the time when our church is able to run one of these
stations. I am not as knowledgeable as I would like to be but I felt it
necessary to reply. The FCC has made great advancements in the area of
broadcasting and I appreciate everything they do to protect the airwaves for
the American public. In regards to the matter of Broadcast Localism, I
live in a community that has several radio stations, but they seem to
be owned by one or two national companies. Some of these stations have
resorted to the practices of Voice-tracking and the use of National Play
lists, thereby silencing any "local' influence on programming and local
issues. I believe that the greatest answer to the problem of Broadcast
Localism has already been

created. I am referring to the LPFM service.
As you are well aware, the communities in this nation are a varied
group. Even in the communities themselves, there exists subgroups and
varied cultures. I believe that the LPFM service is the only way to truly
address the needs and concerns of a community's culturally diverse
citizenship. The limited range and operating capability of LPFM stations
allows communities to have "several" local influences over the airwaves,
not just a couple of cookie cutter styles that are being employed
nationwide. Much less, many restrictions are in place that ensure the
success of LPFM such as the required non-profit status of each station and
other restrictions that limit the amount of LPFM stations allowed to
licensees. The greatest challenge to the implementation of these

services $\langle BR \rangle$ has been the log jam that exists in the licensing stage. I believe that $\langle BR \rangle$ if measures were introduced that

alleviated the many obstacles in
getting a construction permit for a LPFM station, a community's true voice can
be heard. The results of the recent MITRE study seems to have
alleviated any concerns over possible interference. All concerns, I should say,
except the concerns of major broadcasting powerhouses. I believe that
once in place, LPFM stations would truly be a mouthpiece for the people, broadcasting news, public affairs, and yes, even local entertainment. The ability to broadcast a local high school sporting event should count towards local programming, as well as bringing to light local musicians and artisans that otherwise would be passed over by major markets in favor of acts that appeal to certain demographics or target audiences. In other words, let the communities themselves, not money, speak.
Thank you for the opportunity to give my feedback and I am confident
that these issues will soon be

resolved.
 &n

<hr size=1>Do you Yahoo!?

Take Yahoo! Mail with you! Get it on your mobile phone.
--0-1255640087-1088750901=:8822--